

## **II. REMARKS**

### **A. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are pending.

Claims 1, 11-14 and 20 have been amended.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 15, 18 and 21-28 have been cancelled.

### **B. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,347,307 (hereinafter “Sandhu”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,757,710 (hereinafter “Reed”).

Pursuant to MPEP § 2142, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and thus sustain the rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), there must be a clear articulation of the reasons why Applicant’s claimed invention would have been obvious. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398 (2007). The Supreme Court in *KSR* has further noted that an analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be made explicit. Therefore, an obviousness rejection “cannot be sustained with mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, Applicant maintains and respectfully submits that the teachings of Sandhu and Reed, whether viewed independently or in combination, fail to establish a *prima facie* showing of obviousness. However, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and solely to advance prosecution of the claimed invention, Applicant has proposed further amending the independent claims to recite the following limitation:

“wherein at least one of the objects is a Watcher entity configured to monitor the modeled financial product, the Watcher entity being triggered in response to a change in the modeled financial product” (emphasis added).

Sandhu describes the use of a dynamic Document Object Model (“DOM”), wherein the “DOM provides a standard set of objects for representing HTML and XML documents, a standard for how these objects can be combined, and a standard interface for accessing and manipulating them.” *Sandhu col. 49, lines 26-28*. The DOM is used to “to parse financial objects and apply XML object mapping to the elements and attributes of financial objects.” *Sandhu col. 49, lines 24-26*. While Reed is relied on for allegedly disclosing a means for selecting an object from a palette and dragging the same from the palette to a window. *Office Action, page 3*. Despite the foregoing disclosures, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Sandhu nor Reed discloses the use of an object configured to monitor a financial product. Accordingly, the combined teachings of these references fail to render obvious the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing remarks, amended independent claim 1, including claims 3, 4, 7-9 and 11-13 which depend therefrom, amended independent claim 14, included claims 16, 17 and 19 which depend therefrom, and amended independent claim 20 are patentable over the teachings of Sandhu and Reed, whether taken independently or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

For at least the reasons set forth above, this patent application, as amended, is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this patent application are respectfully requested.

If it will advance the prosecution of this patent application, the Examiner is urged to telephone (973.422.6724) Applicant's undersigned representative. All written communications should continue to be sent to the address provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Lowenstein Sandler PC  
65 Livingston Avenue  
Roseland, NJ 07068

June 26, 2009

By: /Brian W. Weber/  
Brian W. Weber, Esq.  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Reg. No. 58,628